10/24

seventeenth anniversary of the coming into force of the United Nations Charter, a iccument expressing the hope of humanity, it is indeed painful to find ourselves meeting here to detate one of the most flagrant violations of that Charter, a violation by the United States of America which threatens the very existence of cur organization.

The maintenance of international reace and sequently rests on respect for the principles of the Charter, which proclaims the equal rights of nations, including their right to self-determination. We can assess at this moment all the implications of the irresponsible abts which, in violation of these on the ciples, threaten all humanity by hurling it towards the gulf of a thermonuclear war. It is precisely the acts perpetrated by the United States against Cuba, and not other elements as the representative of the United Kingdom has just tried to pretend, which threaten today the peace of the world.

The Security Council, the United Nations, have the urgent duty and the great responsibility of acting with resolution in order to bring an end to the imminent peril which threatens free Cuba and the peace and security of all people.

This is not the first time that the Government of the United States has undertaken actions against the heroic Cuban people. The efforts of the United States to strangle Cuba, to wrest by force the sacred and inalienable right of the Cubar people to peace and independence, began in the first months of the existence of the new revolutionary Government of that country. The Council, and even the General Assembly of the United Nations, have had the matter under study since 1960, and again in the spring of 1961 when the United States organized and financed an armed invasion against Cuba. In this year, the Security Council has twice been informed of the aggressive actions of the United States against Cuba, and the General Assembly itself discussed this question at the second part of the sixteenth session. Everything goes to prove the constant and systematic nature of this dangerous activity of the United States. The economic blockade, the numerous acts of sabotage, the breaking off of diplomatic relations, the attempts to isolate Cuba from the rest of the Latin Amenican countries, the brutal interference in its domestic affairs, the bombing of Guban towns and villages - all these are examples. But this time, an action has been taken which, because of its scope, its consequences and its

Militat

\$/PY.1023 26-38. %m. Walitza, Bomuni_)

character, surpasses everything that was done last year by the United States lovernment against Suba. The hypocrisy of the policy of the United States with regard to Suba is confirmed by the fact that while representatives of the United States Government were speaking of peace from the rostrum of the General Assembly and giving peaceful assurances, in Mashington an armed attack was being prepared against the small State of Suba.



(Mr. Melitza, Romania)

This is what happened in April 1901 when the fulling statements made by the representative of the United States were intended to hide the preparation, organization and financing by his country of an armed invasion against Cuba.

Things happened in the same manner during the course of the present session of the General Assembly when we heard professions of faith by the United States delegation regarding the United Mations Charter and when we heard assurances that the United States "would not commit an aggression against Cuba". All this was intended to cover up the preparations that were being made. The deliberate nature of these provocations is obvious. We are now coming to the end of a long, psychological, political, diplomatic and military preparation for aggression. The setting of this scene was staged, in all its details, by the Government in Mashington.

In 7 September last the President of the United States asked Congress to authorize the calling up of 150,000 reservists. A short while later, on 15 September, President Kennedy made a statement that gave a free hand to the United States Government. On 19 September the United States Congress adopted a resolution on Cuba, according to which all means would be used, including resort to force, and this was adopted as the official policy of the United States. Contrary to what the President of the United States has said, according to which the discovery during the past week of offensive installations in Cuba have led to the blockade, in reality, however, the preparatory measures for this action began much earlier.

On 1 Cotober the plan of action was already on the desk of the State Department The magazine <u>US News and World Report</u> said that the question of the blockade was given very special study by the State Department during the last few weeks, and advice was given by experts who worked on the legal aspect of the matter. On 22 Cotober the United States undertook one of the greatest manceuvres ever undertaken by that country in the Caribbean area. These military manceuvres in the Caribbean area, in which naval and air forces participated, included the landing of amphibious forces which are obviously intended as a dress rehearsal for United States amphibious landings in Cuba. These military manceuvres



Mr. Walitza, Pomania)

aggressive actions which began the day before yesterday. In fact, these mandeuvres and exercises have ceased, but nevertheless the planes and warships continue with their missions which were previously set up in advance within the framework of the blockade.

Together with the direct military preparations on American soil, there are 175 organizations of mercenaries that are carrying out intensive preparations for a new invasion of Cuba.

The cultination of this policy against Subs is constituted by the measures announced by President Kennedy in his televised statement on the evening of 22 lotober of this year.

In view of the constant series of threats, would it not be considered as a legitimate measure that a country should do what it could to organize its defences? Is this not an elementary right belonging to each State which is, furthermore, enshrined in the United Nations Charter? The elternative to not exercising the right of legitimate self-defence would be to surrender unconditionally, that is, to sacrifice national independence and to put itself at the mercy of an aggressor.

Messembly, through the voice of its President, and also here in the Security Council we heard the representative of Cuba state last night, that the Cuban people are peace-loving and wish to devote themselves to peaceful and creative work and that Cuba has no need for offensive weapons. These two representatives of Cuba proved to the General Assembly the firm determination of that country to settle all disputes by negotiations, appealing to conscience and to reason. They made us understand clearly that the organization of their defence is only the necessary result of the policy carried out by the United States against them. If you remove the cause of a matter, then the effect is also removed.

That political and moral authority does the United States have to denounce the defensive system of a country at a time when it is known that they themselves have postered hundreds of aggressive military bases over the world, bases that are thousands of kilometres from their own frontiers? Then the problem of military bases on foreign territories was dispussed in the course of the Disarmament

12/5%3

S/FV.1025 35-35 (ir. Kalitaa Romania

Conference in Geneva, the United States delegation turned a deaf ear to all proposals for the liquidation of such bases. That right has the United States to arrogate to itself the right to criticize and to decide if the military system of a country is of a defensive or offensive character? If anything of an offensive character exists on Cuban territory, it is only the United States military base in Guantanamo. It is the very existence of this base that should be the object of international concern as a possible cause of provocation.

The true reason for the action of the United States Government against Cuba is the political regime chosen by the Cuban people, in full exercise of its sovereign prerogatives. The United States policy of overthrowing the legal Government of Cuba and of changing its social regime has been openly acclaimed. In view of the fact that it cannot train troops to fight against ideas, the United States Government needs to seek pretexts for the purpose of justifying these warlike actions, and thus it was that the pretended danger to the United States by the small State of Cuba was created. In reality, only one thing is at issue here: it is the hate of the imperialist circles in the United States for the Cuban regime. These circles cannot resign themselves to the existence of a sovereign and independent Cuban State which is freed from the colonial domination of the United States.



(<u>or Walitza, Komania</u>)

locay, as always, the aggressor tries to transfer his guilt by invoking a so-called danger to its own security in order to create the appearance of legality. Once again it has even submitted a so-called formal complaint. But the Liulteration of facts cannot expherate the United States Government of its blame. Its aggressive actions constitute a brutal and violent flouting of the principles of the United Nations Charter and they are a negation of the general norms of international law. The United States is guilty of having flagrantly violated the provisions of Article 2 (4) of the United Nations Charter, which requires that:

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the verritorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

These actions are all the more punishable since, as we gather from the statement of Ir. Kennedy, the United States is determined to continue on its course with all the consequences inherent in it.

The path chosen by the United States is a dangerous one. It is only a government that does not even think of the destiny of its own people that can dare to undertake such activities. But the leaders of the United States should realize that we are living in the year 1962, the sixth decade of the twentieth century. Today it is impossible to go back to the period when the Caribbean was proclaimed a United States lake, where every year for the past thirty years there was United States intervention in that region, where the United States Warines set up governments and handed down laws to the people, and where the declared policy of the United States was the "big stick" policy.

But the inevitable march of history continues. People have declared their desire to defend their national sovereignty as a sacred right. The changes that have occurred in the relations of international force have created conditions where aggression cannot go unpunished.

In his statement yesterday evening, the representative of the United States was unable to hide the complete groundlessees of his position. Lacking arguments, in Stevenson had to resort to invective and a false recounting of history. He used outmoded slogans of the cold war in an attempt to slander the socialist countries. But these manceuvres certainly did not hide the complete



weakness of his position. What the United States is asking the Security Council to do in its draft resolution can be summed up in the following shocking words: First, the United States is "gravely concerned" about a situation that it has created itself; it notes "that further continuance of the Cuban situation may lead to direct conflict", after having itself pushed the matter to the most dengerous extreme. Secondly, the United States asks the United Mations to take note that a quarantine is being imposed round the island of Cuba. This is a mayal and military blockade which the United States has already unilaterally and abusively instituted and which goes beyond and against the United Nations. Thirdly, it wants the United Nations to control the Cuban installations, but not United States attitude and behaviour. Fourthly, it resorts to the ideal solution for an aggressor -- and the Suez experience is very eloquent here. The United States wishes to achieve its ends by unilateral means and then to turn to the United Nations to obtain the official rubber stamp on its results. Finally, if these efforts are successful, the United States is quite generously prepared to end the quarantine measures which it has set up.

This document, which contains so many distortions, contradictions and clumsy subterfuges, is contrary to the very spirit of responsibility that should characterize the resolutions that we do adopt. We know that in United States speeches the United Nations has very often been mentioned as an instrument of United States foreign policy. However, the contempt for this Organization should not be pushed to the point of asking the Organization to endorse the aggressive acts of the United States. The United States is purely and simply asking the Security Council to bless and sanction its aggression against Cuba. In other words, the Security Council is requested to give the United States a certificate of good conduct for the blockade, which is both military and economic, against Cuba, to obtain our sanction of an invasion equipped and financed by the United States, and our approval of the interference by the United States in the domestic affairs of Cuba. We are asked to approve an armed blockade that was decreed yesterday and the direct aggression by the United States against Cuba.

Such behaviour on the part of the United Nations would be tantamount to giving encouragement to aggressors. It would mean that we are bowing and surrendering to aggression. Such action would create in relations among States the need for and approval of the use of force.

7....

3/FM.1023 38-40 (<u>M. Valitza, Romania</u>)

The Romanian delegation believes that the aggressive action of the United States against Suba constitutes a threat to peace unier Article 39 of the Charter. It is the duty of the Security Council to confemn the action of the United States against Suba and to take all necessary measures in order to end such action. The United Nations must impose on the Government of the United States respect for the fundamental principles of the Charter and for the norms of international law. The naval blockade set up by the United States in time of peace is designed to limit the freedom of the high seas and to hand over such freedom to one State. This is extremely dangerous to the equal rights that all States enjoy in the use of the high seas. The Members of the United Nations that ratified the Geneva Convention on the use of the high seas, which recognized the legal force of such an agreement, cannot allow such a violation to go uncondemned and unpunished. The acts of piracy undertaken by the United States threaten not only the vessels belonging to one State but constitute a threat to the vessels of all States. These acts reflect the policy of force which has for years envenomed the international atmosphere.

It is surprising, to say the least, to hear the representative of the United Kingdom, one of the greatest maritime powers of the world, state his agreement to the naval blockade, which has been applied abusively, insultingly and unilaterally by the United States. These States are preparing to support acts of piracy, which disregard the economic needs and requirements of every country, including the United Kingdom itself. Recently, the leaders of the British Chamber of Shipping stated that the British shipbuilders wanted their right of trade to be respected as well as their right to sail the high seas.



5/27.1023 41

(Ar. Maliting, Romania)

These interested whiled Mingdom chroles reminded to that the principle of the Tree use of the high seas -- the "freedom of the seas" as it is called -- was in the past so important to the United States itself that in 1912 and 1817 it was willing to go to war in order to have it respected by other nations.

According to international instruments -- and I cite the Leclaration on Armed Meutrality of 1780, the Paris Declaration of 1857 on Maritime War, the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907, and the London Declaration of 1909 on rights of maritime war -- a military blockade goes beyond the shores of a mation and, therefore, cunnot be instituted unless war has begun between the countries themselves. In setting up such a blockede against Cuba the United States has committed an act of war against that country. The military blockade is one of the forms of war. It has been defined as such in many international instruments, and I would cite, particularly, the three conventions on the definition of aggression concluded in London on 3 July and 5 July 1933 that were recognized by many states, including the United States of America. In the statement made by the military prosecutor in the course of the Nurchburg trials, a number of allusions were made to these conventions, in which it is stated clearly, "The aggressor in an international conflict will be considered to be that State which is the first to commit one of the following acts" -- and one of those acts is "the naval blockade of the coasts and ports of another State".

The people and the Government of Romania categorically condemn the aggressive actions of the United States against heroic Cuba -- actions which constitute not only a violation of the right of peoples to peace, freedom and national independence, but also a provocation that may well push the world towards a catastrophe, towards a nuclear war. The Cuban people, like all peoples, has the inalienable right to self-determination and to decide its own future according to its own convictions, without foreign interference or threats of any shape or form. The Government and the people of Romania wish to express their sympathy for and their solidarity with the just struggle of the heroic people of Cuba and its revolutionary Government to rebuff the aggression organized by the United States.

(interface description (interface)

The Rumanian Government will give all supplies to telemines tending to stop the aggression. At this grave moment we trust that responsible spokesmen and politicians will use all their resources of calm, wisdom and knowledge, that reason will prevail and that they will be able to stop this dangerous course of events. When mankind as a whole is concerned over the consequences of these acts on the part of the United States against Cuba, and when every human being is profoundly concerned over the fate of peace, we express the hope that the Security Council also will become aware of all its responsibility and will accordingly adopt resolutions in keeping with what the world expects of it.

The Romanian delegation considers that it is the duty of the Security Council to condemn firmly the action of the United States against Cuba -- action which threatens international peace and security. The Security Council must insist on the immediate annulment of the naval blockade and the cessation of all interference in the internal affairs of the Republic of Cuba, as well as of any other State. In keeping with this, my delegation wholeheartedly supports the draft resolution (S/5187) submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union, which provides the concrete and effective means whereby to solve the serious problem at present under discussion in the Council, and we shall vote in favour of that draft resolution.

